



High Carbon Intensity Crude Oil

Transportation Committee Workshop on Transportation Energy Demand and Fuel Infrastructure Issues

Transportation Committee Workshop

September 9, 2011

Gordon Schremp




Fuels and Transportation Division

California Energy Commission

gschremp@energy.state.ca.us



High-Carbon Intensity Crude Oil (HCICO)





Background

- The purpose of this provision of the LCFS is to ensure that any rise in petroleum-related lifecycle emissions due to a movement of crudes with high extraction emissions is captured in the LCFS and mitigated
- Energy Commission staff conducted an initial screen of 248 Marketable Crude Oil Names (MCONs) that were available globally during 2006-2010 to identify what portion were potential HCICOs
- Purpose of the work was to determine to what extent refiners in California would have to either compensate or defer purchase for processing in California




Types of Potential HCICOs

- Oil sands (bitumen) mining - ***potential HCICO***
 - Exclusive to Canada
- Heavy oil upgrading – Canada & Venezuela
 - Processing heavy crude oil in upgrader to produce lighter synthetic crude oil - ***potential HCICO***
- Flaring of associated natural gas
 - Countries that have average crude oil flaring intensities greater than 10 standard cubic meters per barrel - ***potential HCICO***
 - Russia, Nigeria & 6 other countries
- Enhanced oil recovery (EOR)
 - water flooding
 - injection of natural gas, carbon dioxide or chemicals
 - thermally enhanced oil recovery (TEOR) – ***potential HCICO***




California Produces TEOR Crude Oil





Summary of Screening Results






Potential HCICOs – Initial Screening Results

- 197 MCONs receive a “pass” – 32 from Base Line countries
 - **None** of the Base Line foreign country MCONs would have received a “fail”
 - Nearly 51% of California MCONs would fail TEOR screen, as of 2009
- 51 MCONs receive a “fail” and are potential HCICOs
 - 8 of 45 import MCONs during 2009
- 45 MCONs exceed the 10.0 m³ per barrel limit – “fail” using the O&GJ crude oil production data for the intensity calculation
- 61 MCONs originate from countries that are listed in the Oil & Gas Enhanced Oil Recovery Survey in 2010
- 4 MCONs sourced from bitumen mines & “fail” screen
- 6 additional MCONs are processed by upgraders & “fail” screen




Screening Results – Volume Weighted



Source: Energy Commission analysis.



2010 Potential HCICO Imports





HCICO – Ability to Offset Emissions

- Refiners can use HCICOs, but need to offset the incremental carbon emissions or debt
- If refiners used a quantity of potential HCICOs similar to 2010 (roughly 8 percent), they would need to use ethanol from California & Brazil in all of the gasoline they produce – beginning this year
- Even if refiners were to use as little as 2 percent HCICOs in their mix of crude oil, use of ethanol from the Midwest would be effectively infeasible by 2013
- In fact, there are no sources of commercially available ethanol available that could completely offset the incremental carbon debt of using 2 percent HCICOs by 2016
- It is therefore assumed by staff that potential HCICOs would be unavailable for use in California



Oil Production Practices – Response Outlook

- HCICO provision is designed to “encourage emission reduction activities from these HCICO sources”
- Unlikely that companies or governments outside of the United States will alter crude oil production practices because:
 - Producers outside of California have alternative markets to sell their crude oil
 - California crude oil market is too small (between 1.2 percent and 2.1 percent) to justify an investment to reduce the carbon intensity of crude oil production operations
- Companies are making investments in many different countries that have a sufficient return on investment (ROI) achieved by either:
 - Lowering their production costs
 - Capturing natural gas that is being flared (to sell for an additional revenue stream and/or reduce the costs incurred from paying a flaring fee)
 - Avoiding carbon taxes imposed by a local jurisdiction or country



HCICO – Conclusion & Outstanding Issues

- The HCICO provision is not expected to restrict access to crude oil supplies in a way that could significantly impact fuel supply, but it could impact refiner profitability and the ultimate cost of petroleum fuel in California

Outstanding Issues

- Staff did not quantify the potential cost increase that could occur when refiners replace HCICOs with alternative crude oils
 - Would need to know changes in crude oil acquisition costs, impacts on refinery operating costs, and shifts in refined product output
- Staff did not assess potential for crude oil “shuffling”
 - What are the relative distances of sources of HCICOs and their replacements?
- Staff did not qualitatively assess any potential energy security implications of the HCICO provision
 - What framework should be used to rank various sources?



Additional Q & A



Sunset at Moonstone Beach – Humboldt County, California 9-2-2011